

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry "documentary," under the pretense that it is "news," days before the 2004 Presidential Election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. It is questionable whether this program, of dubious origin and with dubious content, may be considered in the public interest.

It is sure that airing this program will be good for the bottom line, however, as it will stimulate press, and viewership on both sides of the election -- pumping up the ad rates which Sinclair may charge.

This is not in the public interest. It is only in the interest of Sinclair's corporate coffers, and possibly those of their shareholders.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

Thank you for your consideration.